DID IMAAM MUHAMMAD IBN 'ABDULWAHHAAB CONSIDER THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE TO BE AN APOSTATE STATE AND DID HE REVOLT AGAINST IT?

The claim about the **"Wahhabis revolting against the Ottomans"**[1] is not a new claim and was mentioned by the enemies of Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhab during his time such as Dahlaan, az-Zahaawee and even Ibn 'Aabideen. Yet Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab *(raheemahullaah)* did not hold it to be Islamically correct to revolt against a Muslim ruler, religious or immoral, so long as they did not enjoin disobedience towards Allaah, because obedience is only with regard to what is right and proper. This further shows that the Ottomans did not rule over Najd during their epoch, this will be highlighted later. Just as the

[1] For example, Khaled Abou El Fadl stated in his article *The Crusader: Why we must take Bin Laden's writings seriously'* in the March/April 2006 edition of the *Boston Review* that:

> **Wahhabis allied themselves with the Saudi family, which in turn relied on the British for military and logistical support, and it is British support that enabled Wahhabi fighters to wage war against the Ottomans. In doing so, the Wahhabis helped the British defeat and dismantle the Ottoman caliphate. Generations of Wahhabi scholars simply ignored this inconsistency; others denied that the British alliance ever existed; and still others masked the contradiction by greatly exaggerating the supposed heresy or apostasy of the Ottomans.**

The real inconsistency is in the fact that the Ottomans themselves sought help from the British and French against the Russians during the Crimean war aswell! So maybe a more detailed study of history needs to be undertaken by some!? Stephen Schwartz, the neo-con Jewish convert to the *Naqshabandee sufi* order states within his poorly researched book *The Two Faces of Islam: The House of Sa'ud from Tradition to Terror* that: **"Soon the itinerant Arab and the imperial British shared a goal: the liquidation of the Ottoman Empire."** (p.67) It is not surprising that Schwartz would make such historical errors, as within the book there is scant reference to the Qur'aan and *hadeeth*, if there is any reference to them at all! Karen Armstrong also made a similar error in this regard by saying **"Abd al-Wahhab declared the Ottomans sultans to be apostates, unworthy of the obedience of the faithful and deserving of death."** So within this excerpt there are two mistakes, naming Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab as **"Abd al-Wahhab"** which is the name of his father and the regurgitated claim about making *takfeer* and *khurooj* against the Ottomans. Karen Armstrong, *The Battle of God: A History of Fundamentalism* (New York: Ballantine Books, 2000), p.44

Some have tried to utilise the claim of the alleged "British spy", yet even the Hamid Algar, an enemy of the *da'wah* of Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab, admits that this is false and invented by the *shee'ah*!

© SalafiManhaj 2007

Ottomans did not rule over West Africa and hence Imaam 'Uthmaan Ibn Foodee (Dan Fodio), *raheemahullaah*, established the Sokoto Caliphate in West Africa; the Ottoman rule did not extend to West Africa.

Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab stated:

> **The Imaams from every Madhhab are agreed concerning the one the forcefully took over a region or regions that he has the ruling of "Imaam" in all matters. If this had not been so then the affairs of the world would never have been established. This is because for a very long time, before the era of Imaam Ahmad till this day of ours, the people have never gathered behind a single Imaam. And they do not know anyone from the Scholars who has mentioned that any of the Sharee'ah rulings cannot be correct (effected, implemented) except by the overall Imaam (the Khaleefah).**[1]

Thirdly, let's turn to what some Islamic historians have concurred, as opposed to the mere diatribes of the unqualified![2] Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez Aal-'AbdulLateef said:

> **Some opponents of the salafi da'wah claim that Imam Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhaab rebelled against the Ottoman Caliphate, thus splitting the jamaa'ah (main body of the Muslims) and refusing to hear and obey (the ruler).**[3]

Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab said in his letter to the people of al-Qaseem:

> **وأرى وجوب السمع والطاعة لأئمة المسلمين برّهم وفاجرهم ما لم يأمروا بمعصية الله ومن ولي الخلافة واجتمع عليه الناس ورضوا به وغلبهم بسيفه حتى صار خليفة وجبت طاعته وحرم الخروج عليه**
>
> **I believe that it is obligatory to hear and obey the leaders of the Muslims, whether they are righteous or immoral, so long as they do not enjoin disobedience towards Allaah. Whoever has become Caliph and the people have given him their support and**

[1] *ad-Durarus-Sunniyyah fil-Ajwibatun-Najdiyyah* vol.7,p.239

[2] Refer to the book by Professor Sulaiman Bin Abdurrahman al-Huqail (Professor of Education at Imaam Muhammad bin Saud University, Riyadh), *Muhammad Bin Abdulwahhâb – His Life and the Essence of his Call* (Riyadh: Ministry of Islamic Affairs, Endowments, Dawah and Guidance, KSA, First Edition, 1421 AH/2001 CE), with an introduction by Sheikh Saleh Bin Abdulaziz Al-Sheikh.

[3] Abdul'Azeez ibn Muhammad Aal 'AbdulLateef, *Da'aawa al-Munaawi'een li Da'wat al-Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahaab* (Riyadh: Daar ul-Watan, 1412 AH), p. 233

© SalafiManhaj 2007

accepted him, even if he has gained the position of caliph by force, is to be obeyed and it is haraam to rebel against him.[1]

And he also said:

الأصل الثالث : أن من تمام الاجتماع السمع والطاعة لمن تأمّر علينا ولو كان عبداً حبشيّاً ..

One of the main principles of unity is to hear and obey whoever is appointed over us even if he is an Abyssinian slave…[2]

And Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez Aal-'AbdulLateef said:

وبعد هذا التقرير الموجز الذي أبان ما كان عليه الشيخ من وجوب السمع والطاعة لأئمة المسلمين برّهم وفاجرهم ما لم يأمروا بمعصية الله : فإننا نشير إلى مسألة مهمة جوابا عن تلك الشبهة فهناك سؤال مهم هو: هل كانت " نجد " موطن هذه الدعوة ومحل نشأتها تحت سيطرة دولة الخلافة العثمانية ؟

After stating these facts which explain that the Shaykh believed it was obligatory to hear and obey the leaders of the Muslims, whether they are righteous or immoral, so long as they do not enjoin disobedience towards Allaah, we may refer to an important issue in response to that false accusation. There is an important question which is: was Najd, where this call originated and first developed, under the sovereignty of the Ottoman state?

Dr Saalih al-'Abood answered this by saying:

لم تشهد " نجد " على العموم نفوذا للدولة العثمانية فما امتد إليها سلطانها ولا أتى إليها ولاة عثمانيون ولا جابت خلال ديارها حامية تركية في الزمان الذي سبق ظهور دعوة الشيخ محمد بن عبد الوهاب رحمه الله ومما يدل على هذه الحقيقة التاريخية استقرار تقسيمات الدولة العثمانية الإدارية فمن خلال رسالة تركية عنوانها : " قوانين آل عثمان مضامين دفتر الديوان"يعني : " قوانين آل عثمان في ما يتضمنه دفتر الديوان " ، ألفها يمين علي أفندي الذي كان أمينا للدفتر الخاقاني سنة 1018 هجرية الموافقة لسنة 1609م من خلال هذه الرسالة يتبين أنه منذ أوائل القرن الحادي عشر الهجري كانت دولة آل عثمان تنقسم إلى اثنتين وثلاثين ايالة منها أربع عشرة ايالة عربية وبلاد نجد ليست منها ما عدا الإحساء إن اعتبرناه من نجد... .

Najd never came under Ottoman rule, because the rule of the Ottoman state never reached that far, no Ottoman governor was appointed over that region and the Turkish

[1] *Majmoo'at Mu'allafaat al-Shaykh*, vol.5, p.11

[2] *Majmoo'ah Mu'allafaat al-Shaykh*, vol.1, p.394; quoted in *Da'aawa al-Munaawi'een*, pp.233-234

© SalafiManhaj 2007

soldiers never marched through its land during the period that preceded the emergence of the call of Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab (may Allaah have mercy on him). This fact is indicated by the fact that the Ottoman state was divided into administrative provinces. This is known from a Turkish document entitled Qawaaneen Aal 'Uthmaan Mudaameen Daftar ad-Deewaan (Laws of the Ottomans concerning what is contained in the Legislation), which was written by Yameen 'Ali Effendi who was in charge of the Constitution in 1018 AH/1609 CE. This document indicates that from the beginning of the eleventh century AH the Ottoman state was divided into 23 provinces, of which 14 were Arabic provinces, and the land of Najd was not one of them, with the exception of al-Ihsa', if we count al-Ihsa' as part of Najd.[1]

And Dr 'Abdullaah al-'Uthaymeen said:

ومهما يكن فإن " نجداً " لم تشهد نفوذاً مباشراً للعثمانيين عليها قبل ظهور دعوة الشيخ محمد بن عبد الوهاب كما أنها لم تشهد نفوذاً قويّاً يفرض وجوده على سير الحوادث داخلها لأية جهة كانت فلا نفوذ بني جبر أو بني خالد في بعض جهاتها ولا نفوذ الأشراف في بعض جهاتها الأخرى أحدث نوعاً من الاستقرار السياسي فالحروب بين البلدان النجدية ظلت قائمة والصراع بين قبائلها المختلفة استمر حادّاً عنيفاً

Whatever the case, Najd never experienced direct Ottoman rule before the call of Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhaab emerged, just as it never experienced any strong influence that could have an impact on events inside Najd. No one had any such influence, and the influence of Bani Jabr or Bani Khaalid in some parts, or the Ashraaf in other parts, was limited. None of them were able to bring about political stability, so wars between the various regions of Najd continued and there were ongoing violent conflicts between its various tribes.[2]

Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez ibn 'Abdullaah ibn Baaz *(may Allaah have mercy on him)* said in response to this false accusation:

لم يخرج الشيخ محمد بن عبد الوهاب على دولة الخلافة العثمانية فيما أعلم وأعتقد فلم يكن في نجد رئاسة ولا إمارة للأتراك بل كانت نجد إمارات صغيرة وقرى متناثرة وعلى كل بلدة أو قرية -

[1] *'Aqeedat al-Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhaab wa atharuha fi'l-'Aalam al-Islami* (unpublished), vol.1, p.27

[2] 'Abdullaah ibn Saalih al-'Uthaymeen, *ash-Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhaab Hayaatuhu wa Fikruhu* (Riyadh: Daar ul-'Uloom, 1412 AH) p.11; quoted in *Da'aawa al-Munaawi'een*, pp.234-235.

© SalafiManhaj 2007

مهما صغرت - أمير مستقل... وهي إمارات بينها قتال وحروب ومشاجرات والشيخ محمد بن عبد الوهاب لم يخرج على دولة الخلافة وإنما خرج على أوضاع فاسدة في بلده فجاهد في الله حق جهاده وصابر وثابر حتى امتد نور هذه الدعوة إلى البلاد الأخرى...

Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab did not rebel against the Ottoman Caliphate as far as I know, because there was no area in Najd that was under Turkish rule. Rather Najd consisted of small emirates and scattered villages, and each town or village, no matter how small, was ruled by an independent emir. These were emirates between which there were fighting, wars and disputes. So Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhaab did not rebel against the Ottoman state, rather he rebelled against the corrupt situation in his own land, and he strove in jihad for the sake of Allaah and persisted until the light of this call spread to other lands…[1]

Dr. 'Ajeel al-Nashmee said:

..... لم تحرك دولة الخلافة ساكنا ولم تبدر منها أية مبادرة امتعاض أو خلاف يذكر رغم توالي أربعة من سلاطين آل عثمان في حياة الشيخ ..

The Caliphate did not react in any way and did not show any discontent or resentment during the life of the Shaykh, even though there were four Ottoman sultans during his lifetime…[2]

Dr. al-Nashmee said, answering this question:

لقد كانت صورة حركة الشيخ محمد بن عبد الوهاب لدى دولة الخلافة صورة قد بلغت من التشويه والتشويش مداه فلم تطلع دولة الخلافة إلا على الوجه المعادي لحركة الشيخ محمد بن عبد الوهاب سواء عن طريق التقارير التي يرسلها ولاتها في الحجاز أو بغداد أو غيرهما ..أو عن طريق بعض الأفراد الذين يصلون إلى الأستانة يحملون الأخبار .

The view that the Caliphate had of the movement of Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhaab was very distorted and confused, because the Caliphate only listened to those who were hostile towards the movement of Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhaab, whether that was via reports sent by their governors in the Hijaaz, Baghdad and elsewhere, or via some individuals who reached Istanbul bearing news.[3]

[1] Conversation recorded on tape; quoted in *Da'aawa al-Munaawi'een*, p. 237

[2] *Majallat al-Mujtama'*, issue no. 510

[3] *Al-Mujtama'*, issue no. 504; quoted in *Da'aawa al-Munaawi'een*, p. 238-239

© SalafiManhaj 2007

With regard to Zalloum's claims that the Shaykh's call was one of the reasons for the fall of the Caliphate and that the English helped the Wahhaabis to topple it, Mahmood Mahdi al-Istanboolee says concerning this ridiculous claim:

> **This writer should be expected to produce proof and evidence for his opinion. Long ago the poet said:**
>
> *If claims are not supported by proof, they are used only by the fools as evidence.*
>
> **We should also note that history tells us that the English were opposed to this call from the outset, fearing that it might wake the Muslim world up.**[1]

And he says:

> **والغريب المضحك المبكي أن يتهم هذا الأستاذ حركة الشيخ محمد بن عبد الوهاب بأنها من عوامل هدم الخلافة العثمانية مع العلم أن هذه الحركة قامت حوالي عام 1811 م وأن الخلافة هدمت حوالي 1922 م**
>
> **The ironic fact is that this professor accuses the movement of Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab of being one of the factors that led to the destruction of the Ottoman Caliphate, even though this movement began in 1811 CE and the Caliphate was abolished in 1922 CE.**[2]

What indicates that the British were opposed to the "Wahhabi movement" is the fact that they sent Captain George Foster Sadlier[3] to **"congratulate Ibrahim Pasha on his success against the Wahhabis"** – during the war of Ibrahim Pasha in Dir'iyyah – and also to find out to what extent he was prepared to cooperate with the British authorities to reduce what they called "Wahhabi piracy in the Arabian Gulf." Indeed, this clearly expressed a desire to establish an agreement between the British government and Ibrahim Pasha with the aim of destroying the "Wahhabis" completely. Sadlier made an arduous journey from India to Riyadh to see the ruins in Dir'iyyah, which was razed to the ground by Ibraheem Pasha.[4]

Shaykh Muhammad ibn Manzoor al-Nu'maanee said:

---

[1] *Al-Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhaab fi Mar'aat al-Sharq wa'l-Gharb*, p. 240

[2] Ibid. p. 64

[3] An officer of the 47th Regiment in the India British army at a time when securing sea routes to India was Britain's main interest. The British were concerned about the rise of the *da'wah* of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab and branded any opposer to British colonial rule in India as being a "Wahhabi", this thus contributed to the scaremongering against the *da'wah* of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab *(raheemahullaah)*.

[4] Jalal AbualRub, Alaa Mencke (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahhab* (Orlando, Florida: Madinah Publishers, 1424 AH/2003 CE), pp.224-231.

© SalafiManhaj 2007

لقد استغل الإنجليز الوضع المعاكس في الهند للشيح محمد بن عبد الوهاب ورموا كل من عارضهم ووقف في طريقهم ورأوه خطرا على كيانهم بالوهابية ودعوهم وهابيين ... وكذلك دعا الإنجليز علماء ديوبند - في الهند - بالوهابيين من أجل معارضتهم السافرة للإنجليز وتضييقهم الخناق عليهم ...

The British made the most of the hostility that existed in India towards Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab and they accused everyone who opposed them and stood in their way, or whom they regarded as dangerous, of being Wahhabis…Similarly the British called the scholars of Deoband – in India – Wahhaabis, because of their blunt opposition to the English[1] and their putting pressure on them.[2]

Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez Aal-'AbdulLateef concludes:

---

[1] Hunter in his book *The Indian Musalmans* noted that during the Indian Mutiny of 1857 CE the British feared uprising from the "Wahhabi" Muslims who were revolting against the British. See W.W. Hunter, *The Indian Musalmans*, first published in London: Trübner and Co., 1871; Calcutta: Comrade Publishers, 1945, 2nd Edn.; Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications, 1999, 2nd Edn.; New Delhi: Rupa & Co., 2002 Reprint.

In Bengal during this time many Muslims, including the old, the young and women, were all branded as being "Wahhabis" and revolters against the British empire and were hanged from 1863-1865 (Peter Hardy, *The Muslims of British India* (Cambridge University Press: 1972), pp.79-80. Hunter stated in his book that: **"There is no fear to the British in India except from the Wahhabis, for they are causing disturbances against them, and agitating the people under the name of jihaad to throw away the yoke of disobedience to the British and their authority."** Those who were imprisoned in the Andaman Islands and tortured were those intellectual scholars of the Salafi community such as Shaykh Ja'far Thanesary, Shaykh 'AbdurRahmaan, Shaykh'AbdulGhaffaar, Shaykh Yahyaa 'Alee (1828 – 1868 CE), Shaykh Ahmad 'Abdullaah (1808-1881 CE), Shaykh Nadheer Husayn ad-Dehlawee and many others. See: Mohamed Jafar, Taareekh ul-'Aajeeb and Taareekh-i-Aajeeb – History of Port Blair (Nawalkshore Press, 2nd Edition, 1892).

Ahmad Ridha al-Brailwee (born 14 June 1865 CE/10 Shawwaal 1272 AH) was assigned the job of dissension and opposed every plan to oppose the British, he rallied around himself a band of heretical supporters who were later known as the Brailwees. For further reading see:

- ✓ Muinuddin Ahmed Khan, *A History of the Fara'idi Movement in Bengal* (Karachi, 1965)
- ✓ Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1982), pp.276-77
- ✓ Qeyamuddin Ahmad (Professor of History at Patna University), *The Wahhabi Movement in India* (New Delhi: Manohar, 1994, 2nd edition). Particularly chapter seven *"The British Campaigns Against the Wahhabis on the North-Western Frontier"* and chapter eight *"State Trials of Wahhabi Leaders, 1863-65."*

[2] *Di'aaya Mukaththafah Didd al- Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhaab*, p. 105-106

© SalafiManhaj 2007

> **From these various quotations we can see the falseness of these flawed arguments when compared to the clear academic proofs in the essays and books of the Shaykh; that falseness is also obvious when compared to the historical facts are recorded by fair-minded writers.**[1]

Other historians in this field who have also affirmed the above include Qeymuddin Ahmad, who noted:

> **In 1577, when the great Ottoman Sultan, Salim (1512-20), conquered Egypt, the Caliphate passed on to the Ottomans, and the Arabian peninsula too came under their control. On account of its distant position and inhospitable terrain, however, Arabia was not under effective Turkish control. Local chiefs held sway in its different, geographically well-defined zones such as the Hijaz and Najd areas and the southern coastal areas.**[2]

Indeed, an honest and informed non-Muslim historian, Michael Field, noted:

> **The Nejd, which is culturally and politically the dominant part of the Kingdom, was never part of the Ottoman Empire, and no part of the Kingdom was ever ruled by a European colonial power.**[3]

With regards to the claim that the followers of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab **"considered everyone as an apostate unless they followed the Wahhabi school of thought"**[4] then we say, and this has been repeated so many times that it almost becomes

---

[1] *Da'aawa al-Munaawi'een*, pp.239, 240

[2] Qeyamuddin Ahmad (Professor of History at Patna University), *The Wahhabi Movement in India* (New Delhi: Manohar, 1994, 2nd edition), p.27

[3] Michael Field, *Inside the Arab World* (Cambridge and Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1995), p.181

[4] This simplistic claim has been suggested by a range of pseudo political analyst to supposed 'experts', yet it is a claim that at times owes more to petty grudges or feelings of resentment towards Saudi Arabia, as opposed to an solid evidence. It is also a claim that is made yet with unsubstantial proof. Professor Madawi al-Rasheed (Professor of Anthropology of Religion at *Kings College, University of London*) for example she states in an article entitled *'Saudis in quest for a 'Luther' to bring tolerant Islam'* (dated: 30/6/06):

> **The foundation narrative of the Saudi state assumed that all Muslims were blasphemous except those who subscribed to its own religious interpretations and become subservient to its political will...Today this religious discourse has backfired and began to haunt those who initially sponsored it. The same Saudi religious**

© SalafiManhaj 2007

repetitive, why cannot the words of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhab be transmitted by the claimants for us to see where he allegedly **"considered everyone as an apostate unless they followed the Wahhabi school of thought"**??

This claim is mentioned by the enemies of *tawheed* past and present, yet none of them has been able to do the simple thing of actually mentioning the words and statements of

---

> **discourse that accused all other Muslims of blasphemy is now turned against the Saudi regime itself, as this regime is labelled a regime of blasphemy by Bin Laden and many religious scholars. While previously state sponsored religious interpretations declared other Arab and Muslim leaders as blasphemous, for example Nasser, Qaddafi, Bourguiba, Khomeini and Saddam, today the Al-Saud themselves are considered blasphemous and unfit to rule. The establishment of the Saudi state was based on mass excommunication of other Muslims. Today the Al-Saud themselves and their ulama are declared blasphemous by people who had been brought up on Saudi religious interpretations."**

See **http://www.madawi.info/index.php/site/more/52/**

Well it hasn't **"backfired and began to haunt those who initially sponsored it"** as not only did the senior scholars of Saudi Arabia ever support extremists mavericks, but the *khawaarij* of the era have always had an issue with Saudi Arabia as they want to place their own selves in authority. Also, it is surprising how any academic could make the error of thinking that the **"Saudi religious discourse"** has **"accused all other Muslims of blasphemy"**, considering all of the overwhelming evidence which will, and has been, presented within this study., which indicates the exact opposite. As for the contention that the Saudi state "was based on mass excommunication of other Muslims" this chapter clearly indicates that there was not the religious basis or teachings of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhab at any time whatsoever and in fact such mass excommunication was against his own position! Therefore, from whence are such commentators extracting these assertions from? We are still waiting for the sources! With regards to those people who declare Saudi Arabia to be "blasphemous" then most of them, if not all, have not been "brought up on Saudi religious interpretations" and if they were then they have stated that they reject it in favour of the views of Sayyid Qutb, Hasan al-Banna, Ayman adh-Dhawaahiree, Aboo Mus'ab az-Zarqaawee, Aboo Muhammad al-Maqdisee, Aboo Qataadah al-Filisteenee, Aboo Baseer at-Tartoosee and others who never had any knowledge-based link to Saudi Arabia whatsoever!

© SalafiManhaj 2007

Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab??! Those who wrote propaganda tracts against Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhab were the likes of Ibn Afaliq,[1] Ahmad bin 'Ali ash-Shaafi'ee al-Qabbaanee,[2] Muhammad ibn Muhammad al-Qadaree,[3] Alawee al-Haddaad,[4] Ibn Suhaym,[5] Dahlaan,[6] Zahaawee,[7] Hasan ibn 'Umar ash-Shatti, Ali Naqi al-Kanhooree,[8] Muhammad Ibn

[1] Muhammad ibn 'AbdurRahmaan ibn Afaliq (d.1163 AH), a contemporary of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab, the manuscript of the treatise wherein Ibn Afaliq states his lies against Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab is present in the *State Library* of Berlin, it was quoted by 'Abdul'Azeez ibn Muhammad Aal 'AbdulLateef in *Da'aawa al-Munaawi'een li Da'wat al-Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahaab* (Riyadh: Daar ul-Watan, 1412 AH), p. 58. Ibn Afaliq wrote a letter to the 'Ameer of 'Uyaynah 'Uthmaan ibn Mu'ammar, trying to incite Ibn Mu'ammar against Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab. Yet when Ibn Mu'ammar did not agree with the claims of Ibn Afaliq, Ibn Afaliq then began writing against Ibn Mu'ammar and accusing him of also making *takfeer* of Muslims! Refer to the book by Professor Sulaiman Bin Abdurrahman al-Huqail (Professor of Education at Imaam Muhammad bin Saud University, Riyadh), *Muhammad Bin Abdulwahhâb – His Life and the Essence of his Call* (Riyadh: Ministry of Islamic Affairs, Endowments, Dawah and Guidance, KSA, First Edition, 1421 AH/2001 CE), with an introduction by Sheikh Saleh Bin Abdulaziz Al-Sheikh, p.163

[2] Another contemporary of Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhab but not much is known about his life, the treatise of al-Qabbaanee is mentioned by Ahmad ibn Ali al-Basaree in *Fasl al-Khitaab fee Rad id-Dalaalaat Ibn 'AbdulWahhaab*, p.65. A manuscript of the book is in the library of *Imaam Muhammad ibn Saud University* in Riyadh. This also demonstrates that the opposers claims have been preserved in order to refute them and it also refutes the claims that the followers of Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab totally destroyed, desecrated and ransacked the works, writings and books of their opposers! Qabbaanee had two writings against Muhammad ibn'Abdulwahhaab, the first was a copy in his handwriting of a book entitled *Kitaab Rad ad-Dalaalah wa Qama' al-Jahaalah* by another scholar called Ahmad Barakat ash-Shaafi'ee al-Azharee at-Tandataawee. While the second is entitled *Kitaab Naqd Qawaa'id ad-Dalaal wa Rafd 'Aqaa'id ud-Dullaal* which is a response to a letter sent by Muhammad ibn'AbdulWahhaab to the'Ulama in Basra.

[3] Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab wrote to him advising him during his time. Al-Qadaree authored *Risaalatun fi'r-Raddi 'alaa'l-Wahhaabiyyah* which is extant in manuscript form in the library at *Imaam Muhammad bin Saud University*, Riyadh.

[4] He authored *Misbahu'l-Anamee wa Jalaa'l-dh-Dhlaam fee Radi Shubuhaat Bida'i-n-Najd* (Cairo: Matba'atu'l-Aamirah, 1335 AH).

[5] Sulaymaan ibn Muhammad ibn Suhaym (d.1181 AH) was one of the scholars of Riyadh, who left for al-Ahsa after Riyadh fell to the first Saudi state. He was also an arch-enemy to the *da'wah* of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab and was one of the first to initiate falsehhod against the Imaam, sending such writings to other Muslim countries.

[6] Ahmad ibn Zaynee Dahlaan (d.1304 AH), a partisan *soofee* judge who lived in Makkah and was a *Shaafi'ee muftee* who spread much in the way of propaganda against Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab.

[7] He authored *al-Fajru's-Saadiq* (Cairo: Maktabah Maleejee, 1323 AH).

[8] A *raafidee* who authored *Kashf un-Niqaabee 'an Aqaa'id Ibn 'AbdulWahhaab* (Najaf: Matba'atu'l-Haydaraayah, 1345 AH).

© SalafiManhaj 2007

Najib Suqiya,[1] Muhammad ibn Jawad Mugniya,[2] Bin Diyaf,[3] Abu'l-Fidaa Ismaa'eel at-Tameemee, Umar bin Abi'l-Fadl Qaasim al-Mahjoob,[4] 'AbdulWahhaab Ahmad Barakaat ash-Shaafi'ee al-Azharee at-Tandataawee[5] and others, yet not one of them would actually quote the Imaam himself.[6] As we can also observe little is known about their lives and their academic and scholarly pursuits in comparison to the abundant documentation related to Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab for example. Furthermore, there unsophisticated arguments were all refuted by the Imaam in his *Kashf ush-Shubuhaat*. When we turn to the actual writings of Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab we find that he stated:

> **As for your assertion that we hold Muslims to be disbelievers and your question as to how we do this and how we do that, I would simply say that we never held the Muslims to be disbelievers. Rather, we never held anyone except polytheists to be disbelievers.**[7]

---

[1] As noted by Muhammad Tawfeeq in his book *Tabyeen ul-Haqq wa's-Sawaab bi'r-Rad 'alaa 'Atbaa'I Ibn 'AbdulWahhaab* (Syria: Matba'atu'l-Fayhaa), p.8

[2] In his book *Hadhihi Hiya'l-Wahhaabiyyah* (1964 CE).

[3] Ahmad ibn Abi'd-Diyaaf (d. 1291 AH/1874 CE) born in Tunis in 1219 AH/1804 CE. He served as secretary to an influential minister of the Husayni state in Tunis, Shakir Sahib at-Taabi', then took to writing from 1827 to the 1860s. In his *Ithaaf Ahl iz-Zamaan* within his summary of Hammuda Pasha's reign in Tunisia (1782-1814 CE) he discusses a so-called "Wahhabi proclamation". See Adel Sulaiman Gamal, Richard Mortel and A.H. Green (Trans.), *A Tunisian Reply to a Wahhabi Proclamation. In Quest of an Islamic Humanism*, vol.22.

[4] Died 1222 AH/1807 CE, he was a student of Abu'l-Fidaa Ismaa'eel at-Tameemee at *Zaytuna University*. His father was an authority in *Maliki fiqh* who served as *Qadi* of Tunisia and also as the Chief *Mufti* of the *Sharee'ah Court*. Mahjoob was a famed *khateeb*, poet and eloquent writer yet his writings against the phenomena that he labelled "Wahhabiya" were rather polemical wherein he justifies *tawassul*, the building of shrines and other innovations. The writings of these Tunisian scholars demonstrated the support that Tunisia had for the Ottoman fight against the so-called "Wahhabis". See Adel Sulaiman Gamal, Richard Mortel and A.H. Green (Trans.), *A Tunisian Reply to a Wahhabi Proclamation. In Quest of an Islamic Humanism*, vol.22.

[5] Not much is known about this individual's life except that he authored three books and moved to Makkaah towards the end of his life in the late 18th century CE. The historian of Najd, Ibn Turki considered him to be one of the four most prolific writers against Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab. See Samer Traboulsi, *An Early Refutation of Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab's Reformist Views. Die Welts des Islams*, vol.42, no.3, 2002, pp.373-390.

[6] They would only bring mere claims akin to the likes of Hamza Yoosuf, Keller, Winter, Zayd Shaakir, Moosaa Furber, GF Haddaad and Kabbaanee today!

[7] Adapted from *Majmoo' Mu'allafaat is'-Shaykh*, vol.5, p.189

© SalafiManhaj 2007

In a letter to Muhammad ibn 'Eeid, one of the religious personalities of Tharmada, Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab stated:

> **As for the assertion of the enemies that I hold them to be disbelievers only by conjecture, or I hold an ignorant person against whom no argument has been established to be a disbeliever, it is a sheer lie and false accusation, leveled by those who intend to drive the people away from the deen of Allaah and His Messenger.**[1]

The Imaam also stated *(raheemahullaah)* in a letter exonerating himself from fabrications concocted by Ibn Suhaym:

> **Allaah knows that the man ascribed to me what I never said and did not even occur to me. One such ascription is that "the people for the last six hundred years had not been on the right path" and that I hold anyone who seeks the intercession of pious people to be a disbeliever" and that I hold al-Busayree to be a disbeliever. My answer to all of these is: this is nothing more than false accusations!**[2]

In a letter to the Shareef of Makkah at the time, Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab stated:

> **As for falsehoods and accusations, their example is the assertion that we hold the people to be disbelievers in general; that we hold migrating to us obligatory and that we affirm the disbelief of a person who does not hold to what we do and does not fight with us to be disbelievers. This and other such assertions are totally false leveled against us in order to drive the people away from the deen of Allaah and His Messenger.**[3]

Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab stated to Ismaa'eel al-Jara'ee of Yemen:

> **As for the assertion that we hold the (Muslim) people in general to be disbelievers, it is a false allegation made public by the enemies to drive people away from this deen. We can only emphatically say that this is a naked lie!**[4]

Rasheed Ridaa stated:

> **The books of the Shaykh contain what is contrary to the allegations. These books tell us that they do not pass the verdict of disbelief except against those who commit acts that are acts of disbelief according to the consensus of the Muslims.**[1]

---

[1] Ibid. vol.5, p.25

[2] Ibid. vol.5, pp.11-12, 62

[3] Ibid. vol.3, p.11

[4] Ibid. vol.5, p.100

© SalafiManhaj 2007

Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab *(raheemahullaah)* also stated:

> **In regards to what has been said of me, that I make takfeer on the general body of Muslims then this a slander of the Enemies, as well as their saying that I say whoever adheres to the Religion of Allah and His Messenger while living in another land then it will not suffice him until he comes to me first then this also is a false accusation. Rather adherence to the Religion of Allah and His Messenger is done in any land however we do make takfeer of the one who affirms belief in the Religion of Allah and His Messenger then turns away from it and diverts the people from it, likewise whoever worships idols after knowing that it is the religion of the Polytheists and a form of beautification to the common people, then this is what we make takfeer of as does every scholar on the face of the earth, they make takfeer of these people, except for the stubborn or ignorant person and Allah knows best, Wa Salaam.**[2]

Finally, the Ottoman state was already in a state of decline and stagnation by the eighteenth century, indeed by the seventeenth century, which the *da'wah* of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab cannot be held accountable for whatsoever. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the capitulations system circumvented the independence of the Ottoman state. It was a system which meant that European traders living in Ottoman territory were not required to observe the law of the land and thus had their own courts and laws by which they were ruled by, they were no longer subject to government control. Was the *da'wah* of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab responsible for this?

By the last quarter of the eighteenth century, the gap between the technical skills of some western and northern European countries and those of the rest of the world grew wider and the Ottomans were left lagging. Was the *da'wah* of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab responsible for this?? In 1791 CE the Ottomans could not sufficiently defend their territories to the extent that the British Prime Minister of the day, William Pitt, contemplated sending British troops to help the Sultan against the Czar of Russia during the Ottoman-Russian war.[3] Was the *da'wah* of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhab responsible for

---

[1] Muhammad Basheer ash-Sahaswani, *Siyaanat ul-Insaan min Wasawis id-Dahlaan* (Riyadh: Najd Press, 1396 AH), p.485

[2] Taken from *ad-Durar-us-Saniyyah* (The Personal Letters of ash-Shaykh Muhammad bin 'Abdil-Wahhaab *(raheemahullaah)*) letter no.19 page 57 and originally translated by Aboo 'Imraan al-Mekseekee

[3] Selim Deringil *(Boğaziçi University*, History Department), *The Turks and Europe: Uninvited Guests of Sharers of a Common Destiny?* Paper presented to the *Center for European Studies*, 24 February 2005

© SalafiManhaj 2007

this?? During the Crimean War (1854-1856)[1] the Ottomans had to seek the help of Britain and France against the Russians, was the *da'wah* of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab responsible for this?? The Ottoman state was in such a state in the nineteenth century that the European powers of France[2], Russia and Britain were occupying parts of its territory and various Ottoman provinces were semi-autonomous and under effective control of local rulers. Was the *da'wah* of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab responsible for this?? The Ottomans had a state policy towards Arabic which was strong and institutionalized but then weakened, creating a barrier between most Muslims and the sources of Islaam. Due to this, a whole host of religious innovations, invented 'spiritual' exercises and odd customs flourished along with blind following of madhhabs. Was the *da'wah* of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab responsible for this??? Allaah says,

إِن يَشَأْ يُذْهِبْكُمْ وَيَأْتِ بِخَلْقٍ جَدِيدٍ

"And if you turn away (i.e. refuse), He will replace you with another people; then they will not be the likes of you."

[1] The roots of this war go back to 1851 when the French forced the Ottomans to make them the "sovereign Christian authority" of the Holy Land which the Russians rejected due to two treaties which were previously made with the Ottomans in 1757 and 1774. the Ottomans thus reversed their decisions and made the Russians the official sovereign Christian authority of the Holy Land and then the French responded with a show of military force in the Black Sea forcing Sultaan 'AbdulMajeed 1 to change his mind. The newest treaty, between France and the Ottomans, confirmed France and the Catholic Church as the supreme Christian organization in the Holy Land, supreme control over the various Christian holy places, and gave the keys to the *Church of the Nativity*, previously in the hands of the Greek Orthodox Church, to the Catholic Church. Angry at this, the Russian tsar sent the 4th and 5th army corps deployed and mobilised along the Danube River. The Russians tried to negotiate another treaty wherein they would regain authority over the Christian communities within the Ottoman empire and the British Prime Minster of the day, Aberdeen encourage the Ottomans to reject this, which led to war. Benjamin Disraeli blamed Aberdeen and Stratford (who negotiated with the Ottomans on behalf of the British) for causing the war and this led to Aberdeen's resignation from office. After a diplomatic process the Sultan proceeded to war, his armies attacked the Russian army near the Danube and the Russian Tsar Nicholas responded by dispatching warships, which destroyed a squadron of Ottoman frigates in northern Turkey at the Battle of Sinop on 30 November 1853. The destruction of the Turkish fleet and heavy Ottoman casualties alarmed both Great Britain and France, which stepped forth in defence of the Ottoman Empire. In 1853, after Russia ignored an Anglo-French ultimatum to withdraw from the Danubian Principalities, Great Britain and France thus declared war.

[2] Who conquered much of the Algerian coast and announced they were rulers of it, as the British were 'masters' of India

© SalafiManhaj 2007

{*Muhammad (47): 38*}

Allaah also says, in another beautiful verse which shows Allaah's wisdom:

ﭐﱡﭐ ﮋ ﯓ ﯔ ﯕ ﯖ ﯗ ﯘ ﯙ ﯚ ﯛ ﯜ ﯝ ﯞ ﯟ ﯠ ﯡ ﯢ ﯣ ﯤ ﯥ ﯦ ﯧ ﯨ ﯩ ﯪ ﯫ ﯬ ﯭ ﯮ ﯯ ﯰ ﯱ ﯲ ﯳ ﯴ ﯵ ﯶ ﯷ ﯸ ﯹ ﯺ ﯻ ﯼ ﯽ ﯾ ﯿ ﰀ ﰁ ﰂ ﰃ ﰄ ﰅ ﰆ ﰇ ﰈ ﰉ ﰊ ﰋ ﰌ ﰍ ﰎ ﰏ ﰐ ﰑ ﰒ ﰓ ﰔ ﰕ ﰖ ﰗ ﰘ ﰙ ﰚ ﰛ ﰜ ﰝ ﰞ ﰟ ﰠ ﰡ ﰢ ﰣ ﰤ ﰥ ﰦ ﰧ ﰨ ﰩ ﰪ ﰫ ﰬ ﰭ ﰮ ﰯ ﰰ ﰱ ﰲ ﰳ ﰴ ﰵ ﰶ ﰷ ﰸ ﰹ ﰺ ﰻ ﰼ ﰽ ﰾ ﰿ ﱀ ﱁ ﱂ ﱃ ﱄ ﱅ ﱆ ﱇ ﱈ ﱉ ﱊ ﱋ ﱌ ﱍ ﱎ ﱏ ﱐ ﱑ ﱒ ﱓ ﱔ ﱕ ﱖ ﱗ ﱘ ﱙ ﱚ ﱛ ﱜ ﱝ ﱞ ﱟ ﱠ ﱡ ﱢ ﱣ ﱤ ﱥ ﱦ ﱧ ﱨ ﱩ ﱪ ﱫ ﱬ ﱭ ﱮ ﱯ ﱰ ﱱ ﱲ ﱳ ﱴ ﱵ ﱶ ﱷ ﱸ ﱹ ﱺ ﱻ ﱼ ﱽ ﱾ ﱿ ﲀ ﲁ ﲂ ﲃ ﲄ ﲅ ﲆ ﲇ ﲈ ﲉ ﲊ ﲋ ﲌ ﲍ ﲎ ﲏ ﲐ ﲑ ﲒ ﲓ ﲔ ﲕ ﲖ ﲗ ﲘ ﲙ ﲚ ﲛ ﲜ ﲝ ﲞ ﲟ ﲠ ﲡ ﲢ ﲣ ﲤ ﲥ ﲦ ﲧ ﲨ ﲩ ﲪ ﲫ ﲬ ﲭ ﲮ ﲯ ﲰ ﲱ ﲲ ﲳ ﲴ ﲵ ﲶ ﲷ ﲸ ﲹ ﲺ ﲻ ﲼ ﲽ ﲾ ﲿ ﳀ ﳁ ﳂ ﳃ ﳄ ﳅ ﳆ ﳇ ﳈ ﳉ ﳊ ﳋ ﳌ ﳍ ﳎ ﳏ ﳐ ﳑ ﳒ ﳓ ﳔ ﳕ ﳖ ﳗ ﳘ ﳙ ﳚ ﳛ ﳜ ﳝ ﳞ ﳟ ﳠ ﳡ ﳢ ﳣ ﳤ ﳥ ﳦ ﳧ ﳨ ﳩ ﳪ ﳫ ﳬ ﳭ ﳮ ﳯ ﳰ ﳱ ﳲ ﳳ ﳴ ﳵ ﳶ ﳷ ﳸ ﳹ ﳺ ﳻ ﳼ ﳽ ﳾ ﳿ ﴀ ﴁ ﴂ ﴃ ﴄ ﴅ ﴆ ﴇ ﴈ ﴉ ﴊ ﴋ ﴌ ﴍ ﴎ ﴏ ﴐ ﴑ ﴒ ﴓ ﴔ ﴕ ﴖ ﴗ ﴘ ﴙ ﴚ ﴛ ﴜ ﴝ ﴞ ﴟ ﴠ ﴡ ﴢ ﴣ ﴤ ﴥ ﴦ ﴧ ﴨ ﴩ ﴪ ﴫ ﴬ ﴭ ﴮ ﴯ ﴰ ﴱ ﴲ ﴳ ﴴ ﴵ ﴶ ﴷ ﴸ ﴹ ﴺ ﴻ ﴼ ﴽ ﴾ ﴿ ﵀ ﵁ ﵂ ﵃ ﵄ ﵅ ﵆ ﵇ ﵈ ﵉ ﵊ ﵋ ﵌ ﵍ ﵎ ﵏ ﵐ ﵑ ﵒ ﵓ ﵔ ﵕ ﵖ ﵗ ﵘ ﵙ ﵚ ﵛ ﵜ ﵝ ﵞ ﵟ ﵠ ﵡ ﵢ ﵣ ﵤ ﵥ ﵦ ﵧ ﵨ ﵩ ﵪ ﵫ ﵬ ﵭ ﵮ ﵯ ﵰ ﵱ ﵲ ﵳ ﵴ ﵵ ﵶ ﵷ ﵸ ﵹ ﵺ ﵻ ﵼ ﵽ ﵾ ﵿ ﶀ ﶁ ﶂ ﶃ ﶄ ﶅ ﶆ ﶇ ﶈ ﶉ ﶊ ﶋ ﶌ ﶍ ﶎ ﶏ ﶐ ﶑ ﶒ ﶓ ﶔ ﶕ ﶖ ﶗ ﶘ ﶙ ﶚ ﶛ ﶜ ﶝ ﶞ ﶟ ﶠ ﶡ ﶢ ﶣ ﶤ ﶥ ﶦ ﶧ ﶨ ﶩ ﶪ ﶫ ﶬ ﶭ ﶮ ﶯ ﶰ ﶱ ﶲ ﶳ ﶴ ﶵ ﶶ ﶷ ﶸ ﶹ ﶺ ﶻ ﶼ ﶽ ﶾ ﶿ ﷀ ﷁ ﷂ ﷃ ﷄ ﷅ ﷆ ﷇ ﷈ ﷉ ﷊ ﷋ ﷌ ﷍ ﷎ ﷏ ﷐ ﷑ ﷒ ﷓ ﷔ ﷕ ﷖ ﷗ ﷘ ﷙ ﷚ ﷛ ﷜ ﷝ ﷞ ﷟ ﷠ ﷡ ﷢ ﷣ ﷤ ﷥ ﷦ ﷧ ﷨ ﷩ ﷪ ﷫ ﷬ ﷭ ﷮ ﷯ ﷰ ﷱ ﷲ ﷳ ﷴ ﷵ ﷶ ﷷ ﷸ ﷹ ﷺ ﷻ ﷼ ﷽ ﷾ ﷿ ﷻ

"O you who have believed, whoever of you should revert from his religion – Allaah will bring forth (in place of them) a people He will love and who will love Him (who are) humble toward the believers, powerful against the disbelievers; they strive in the cause of Allaah and do not fear the blame of a critic. That is the favor of Allaah; He bestows it upon whom He wills. And Allaah is all-Encompassing and Knowing."

{*al-Maa'idah (5): 54*}

In the eighth volume of *Kitaab ul-Istiqsaa fi't-Tarikh al-Maghrib al-Aqsaa*, a history of north-west Africa in nine volumes by a Moroccan Muslim scholar and historian Abu'l-'Abbaas Ahmad bin Khaalid an-Naasiree *(raheemahullaah)*[1], he discussed at length the *da'wah* of Imaam

[1] He is Abu'l-'Abbaas Ahmad bin Khaalid bin Muhammad bin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Muhammad an-Naasiree and his lineage goes back to 'Abdullaah bin Ja'far bin Abee Taalib, husband of the sister of Hasan and Husayn *(radi Allaahu 'anhum)*. An-Naasiree was from a family that was known for virtue and knowledge which had migrated to the city of Salaa (Salè), near Rabat in Morocco in 1220 AH/1805 CE. He was born on Saturday 22 Dhu'l-Hijjah 1250 AH/March 1835 CE in Salaa, which at that time was a city that was known for Islamic sciences, Arabic language and the study of Islamic texts. He studied the Qur'aan (Warsh 'an Naafi') with al-Hajj Muhammad 'Alawee as-Salaawee and Muhammad bin Jeelaanee al-Haamidee. He also studied the works of ash-Shaatibee, Ibn 'AbdulBarr, Ibn Maalik and Ibn Subkee with his cousin 'AbdusSalaam bin Talhah. An-Naasiree studied the sciences of the Arabic language with his teacher 'Allaamah Muhammad bin 'Abdul'Azeez as-Salaawee and studied a number of works on grammar, *balaaghaa* (rhetoric), logic, *fiqh* and *usool ud-deen*. He was pivotal in disseminating knowledge, conducting research and benefiting the general masses of people in Morocco, excelling in historical works. He was also concerned with socio-religious issues moreso that most scholars of the time. He was very eloquent and as a result his lessons would be full and would have an effect on those present. He was strongly influenced by the *sunnah* in all affairs and strongly opposed the people of innovation and refuted them, exhorting them to

© SalafiManhaj 2007

Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab. An-Naasiree states that Sultaan Sulaymaan ibn Muhammad ibn 'Abdullaah al-Alawee (who succeeded his father as king of Morocco) was given the pledge of allegiance in Fez in 1226 AH/1811 CE was thus a contemporary of the Imaam and scholar Sa'ud ibn 'Abdul'Azeez ibn Muhammad ibn Saud. Sultaan Sulaymaan wanted to closely examine the *da'wah* in Saudi and thus sent his son Aboo Ishaaq Ibraaheem (in 1226 AH/1811 CE) with a delegation of Moroccan scholars and notables with a letter from his father (Sulaymaan). An-Naasiree stated:

> **Many among those who accompanied Ibraaheem during that hajj trip told us that they did not witness any deviation in Islamic Law from Imaam 'Abdullaah ibn Saud or his retinue. On the contrary, what they observed is steadfastness and care in performing the Islamic acts of worship, such as prayer, tahaarah, fasting, forbidding evil and cleansing the Two Holy Sanctuaries of impure and evil practices that used to be committed therein without objection from anyone. When 'Abdullaah ibn Sa'ud met**

refer back to the Qur'aan and *sunnah*. He opposed the leaders and sects of desires who had entered into the *deen* that which was not from it, **"He also strongly safeguarded waking the Muslims from their heedlessness to the clear manhaj"**, (Biography by Ja'far and Muhammad an-Naasiree, *Kitaab ul-Istiqsaa' li-Akhbaar Duwal al-Maghrib al-'Aqsa* (Daar ul-Baydaa [Casablanca]: Daar ul-Kitaab, 1954), vol.1, pp.14-15). From his most correct and authentic books in particular are his historical *magnum opus, Taarikh ul-Istiqsaa'* and *Ta'dheem ul-Minnah bi'n-Nasrati's-Sunnah* which according to Ja'far and Muhammad an-Naasiree in their biography of him in the first volume of *Kitaab ul-Istiqsaa'*, **"are filled with warning against this disease and these (false) opinions by paying attention to spreading authentic Islamic knowledge amongst the ummah and referring people to study from the books of the Salaf."** He advised a number of governors in Morocco during his era on issues related to governance, economics and the *deen*, he thus travelled to the cities of Tanger, al-'A'raaish (Larache), Marraakush (Marrakech), Daar ul-Baydaa' (Casablanca), Salaa (Sale), Tetwaan (Tetoun), Ghumaarah etc. initially he refused the posts as he thought that they would avert him from his scholastic efforts. He died on Thursday 16 Jumadaa Ulaa 1325 AH/12 October 1897 CE. He authored over thirty books (see ibid. pp.27-34) and his two main students were the jurist and author of Salaa, al-Hajj Tayyib 'Awaad and the historian Aboo 'Abdullaah Muhammad bin 'Ali ad-Dakaalee as-Salaawee. From the titles of the works that he authored, there is nothing whatsoever that shows that he was *Soofee* and in fact the lengthy biography of him by Ja'far and Muhammad an-Naasiree, there is no reference made whatsoever to Sufism. Furthermore, from the thirty works that he authored, none of the books have anything to do with Sufism, the contrary in fact, in the form of his books *Ta'dheem ul-Minnah bi'n-Nasrati's-Sunnah*. There may have been some members of his extended family and clan that were *soofees*, but as for Abu'l-'Abbaas there is nothing to suggest that he was. Kurt S. Vikør in his book *Sufi and Scholar on the Desert Edge: Muhammd bin 'Ali al-Sanusi and his Brotherhood* (London: Hurst & Co., 1995) refers to Ahmad bin Khaalid an-Naasiree as being an historian and no where mentions him as being a *soofee*, and refers to others from the Naasiree family as clearly being *soofees*. An-Naasiree died on 16 Jumadaa al-Ulaa 1315 AH/October 12 1897 CE, *raheemahullaah*.

© SalafiManhaj 2007

with Ibraaheem he showed him the type of respect due to members of the Prophet's family. Ibn Saud sat next to Ibraaheem as an acquaintance, among other things that Ibn Saud spoke about was that he asked the Moroccan delegation about this "People claim that we commit deviation from the Prophet's sunnah. What part of the sunnah did you see us contradict and what did you hear about us from people before we met?" Judge Aboo Ishaaq Ibraaheem az-Zadaagaa, the (Moroccan) scholar who led the discussion with the Saudi Imaam said "We heard that you say Allaah has settled on His throne in a humanly tangible manner that indicates His having a body." Abdullaah Ibn Saud responded, "We seek refuge in Allaah from this statement, we only repeat the statement of Imaam Maalik (raheemahullaah) that "Istiwaa[1] is known,[2] the kayfiyyah (how) is unknown,[3] asking about how it happened is an innovation and believing that istiwaa occurred is an obligation." Is anything wrong with this statement?" the judge said "No, this is also our belief." The judge then asked, "We were told that you deny that the Prophet and his brothers from the Prophets, peace be upon the, are alive in their graves." When Ibn Sa'ud heard the Prophet's name he raised his voice reciting the prayers and peace upon him, saying "We seek refuge in Allaah from this idea too. We believe that he, and the rest of the Prophets, are alive in their graves, in a type of life that is above the life enjoyed by the martyrs"…[4]

An-Naasiree then commented:

I believe that Sultaan Sulaymaan believed in this too and this is why he wrote his famous treatise in which he criticized the extreme austerity of the soofees who lived during his time and warned against abandoning the sunnah and excessive engagement in bida' (innovation). He also explained in his message the proper

[1] Allaah's rising above His Throne

[2] We know the linguistic meaning of 'istiwaa'

[3] Because we do not comprehend Allaah's true essence of existence

[4] Shaykh Abu'l-'Abbaas Ahmad bin Khaalid an-Naasiree, *tahqeeq* (verifying and checking) by Ja'far and Muhammad an-Naasiree, *Kitaab ul-Istiqsaa' li-Akhbaar Duwal al-Maghrib al-'Aqsa* (Daar ul-Baydaa' [Casablanca]: Daar ul-Kitaab, 1954), Vol.8, pp.121-122.

There is also a new annotated edition by M. Hajji, B. Boutaleb & A. Tawfiq (Daar ul-Baydaa' [Casablanca]: Mansurat Wizarat al-Taqafa wa-l-Ittisal, 2001-2005 CE) in 8 volumes. The oldest edition is the 1949 CE edition which is in nine volumes. A summarized edition was also published into three volumes in 1418 AH/1997 CE again by Daar ul-Kitaab in Casablanca and an-Naasiree himself published it himself in four volumes in Cairo in 1894 CE. It was translated into French by the Orientalists Grauille in 1906 CE, G.S. Colin in 1923-25 CE, Fumey in 1934-36 CE. This first edition mentioned in this footnote is available from the library at SOAS, University of London and the ninth volume discusses the 'Alawee dynasty in Morocco.

© SalafiManhaj 2007

manner of visiting graves of righteous people and warned against excessive behaviour that commoners might commit at their vicinity as sincere advice to the Muslims, may Allaah increase him in goodness. Sultaan Sulaymaan also decided that a certain speech that emphasizes tawheed and rebukes bida' be recited in all masaajid where jumu'ah is held. He also instructed soofee zawiyas be closed down.[1]

A balanced and fair non-Muslim historian, Gerald De Gaury, noted with regards to the how Islaam was being practiced throughout the Muslim world in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries:

Nowhere else in the Muslim world would this have been possible except in Arabia, and only in a country given to laxness could there have been such a sweeping and violent changeover in so short a period. Near to the heart of Arabia, Islam-or Muhammadanism-can be and is practiced as it was revealed, but farther afield, among Muhammadans of other races and less pure Arab stock, it has been changed to suit their different minds and other conditions of life.[2] **The Persians are mostly of the Shiah sect, a more colourful version of Islam, spiced with self-inflicted cruelties at the annual Moharram passion play. The Afghans, Kurds, and the Algerians prefer the more secretive rites of the Derwish orders. Egyptian and Indian Muslims, the Turks and the Bokharans, the Muhammadans of the Far East, and West and Central Africa all have found or devised a sect to suit themselves. Thousands therefore look to shrines not often heard of in the West-to Abdul Qadir al Gilani, in Baghdad; to those at Nejef and Kerbala, in Iraq; Meshad in Persia; and the holy sites of North Africa**[3]**-but ultimately Mecca is the holiest city of all, and the Wahhabis follow the creed nearest to that**

[1] Shaykh Abu'l-'Abbaas Ahmad bin Khaalid an-Naasiree, *tahqeeq* (verifying and checking) by Ja'far and Muhammad an-Naasiree, *Kitaab ul-Istiqsaa' li-Akhbaar Duwal al-Maghrib al-'Aqsa* (Daar ul-Baydaa' [Casablanca]: Daar ul-Kitaab, 1954), Vol.8, p.123.

[2] Some may praise versions of Islaam which reflect peoples ethnic and cultural backgrounds, yet the problem with this is that a host of odd traditions and a vast array of obscure practices become integrated into Islaam to the extent that people then think that such customs are actually from the Qur'aan, *sunnah* and way of the early Muslims (*Salaf*). Yet the reality is that grave worshipping, pilgrimages to graves, dancing in mosques, forced marriages, female genital mutilation and other cultural habits that Muslims are engrossed in have nothing whatsoever to do with the authentic teachings of Islaam.

[3] There are no Islamic "holy sites in North Africa" whatsoever!

© SalafiManhaj 2007

revealed by the Prophet.[1] It was descendents of these men, leaders of the second Wahhabi revival, whom we had been seeing.[2]

[1] This should actually be **"revealed <u>to</u> the Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam)"**!

[2] Gerald De Gaury, *Arabia Phoenix: An Account of a Visit to Ibn Sa'ud* (London: George G. Harrap & Co., 1946), pp.95-6

© SalafiManhaj 2007